

Document Log Item

| Addressing | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| From | To |
| "Mabey, Bill" <BMabey@TechLawInc.com> | James Chang/R9/USEPA/US@EPA |
| CC | BCC |
| "Balkissoon, Indira" <IBalkissoon@TechLawInc.com> "Snow, Mary" <msnow@TechLawInc.com> | |
| Description Form Used: Memo | |
| Subject | Date/Time |
| RE: George OU4 FS | x# Ds% |
| # of Attachments | Total Bytes |
| 0 | 10,633 |
| NPM | Contributor |
| | |
| Processing | |
| Comments | |
| | |
| | |

Body

Document Body

James ,
It was the building where pesticides were handled, prepared, etc.
They
were looking for dieldrin, but only found chlordane of concern.
The
area where chlordane was found is just outside a door, so I
expect it
was an area where they may have done washouts of equipment, etc.
There
were two hits above the residential PRG, and the AF said they
could not

reproduce the highest value in the second round of sampling. I still think it was real, it just real difficult to do soil sampling in a small area. The building is said to be scheduled for demolition, so going through the whole IC discussion may be more effort than it is worth. How about a notice that pesticides were used and found in the small area, and that construction should proceed with appropriate protection.
Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 11:01 AM
To: Mabey, Bill
Cc: Balkissoon, Indira; Snow, Mary
Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

Bill,
Given that the cleanup is done, and baseline risk assessment numbers are provided in the FS, I don't see any show stopper risk issues except that the risk information can be presented more clearly. As for Bldg 513, my risk assessor wonders what other contaminates are under the building. See you tomorrow.

James Chang
Phone: 415.972.3193 Fax: 415.947.3526

"Mabey, Bill"
<BMabey@TechLawInc.com> To
"Snow, Mary"
01/03/2008 03:25 <msnow@TechLawInc.com>, James
PM Chang/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
"Balkissoon, Indira"
<IBalkissoon@TechLawInc.com>
Subject
RE: George OU4 FS

James,
A point of clarification on Specific Comment 4 regarding the
Building
513 Chlordane Soil Contamination: The initial investigation
showed a
24,000 ug/kg chlordane concentration in soil. A repeat sampling
found
approx 3,000 ug/kg in the area, but did not find the higher
concentration. At a subsequent BCT it was agreed that further
investigation of this small area was not warranted; since the
location
was just outside the building where equipment washout activities
could

have occurred I think the 24,000 number could be real, but the Air Force says the 24,000 number was not confirmed. The area is small and the BCT agreed that remediation was not necessary. In SC 19 we do ask that the AF recognize the value above the residential PRG of 1,600 ug/kg. Because the Building is scheduled for demolition, the hassle of defining an IC may not be worthwhile for this FFS and the followup ROD. Let us know if you want these comments revised.
Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Snow, Mary
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2008 8:30 AM
To: Snow, Mary; 'Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira
Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

Please forgive me. It is attached this time!
-Mary

-----Original Message-----

From: Snow, Mary
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 4:45 PM
To: 'Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira
Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

Happy New Year James,
Attached you will find our review of the FFS for OU 4. Please feel free to call Bill or me if you have any questions or would like to discuss it further.
Thanks, Mary

-----Original Message-----

From: Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 6:48 AM
To: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira; Snow, Mary
Cc: Commisso.Angela@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: George OU4 FS

Mary/Bill,
Please conduct a detailed review of subject FS and give me your
inputs
by Dec 26. Since all required removals have been done, and some
sites
require ICs, focus your review for following areas:
- The discussion of remedies and determine if they adequately
support
the remedial action objectives.
- If FS supports the CERCLA process.
- If FS is adequate documentation for the ROD.
Let me know a week in advance of Dec 26 you're going to have
problems
meeting that due date. Thanks.

(See attached file: Draft OU 4 FFS.pdf)

James Chang
Phone: 415.972.3193 Fax: 415.947.3526